

Mary Masters, and several do represent domestic, or domesticated, animals such as the sow, hen, or goldfinch. Given her sophisticated ecofeminist perspective, I suspect that Milne would have something interesting to say about this popular, but still critically neglected, eighteenth-century poetic form.

Unfortunately glaring in a book of this modest length are several errors of fact or editorial lapse. The uninitiated reader might wonder when Collier's important poem, *The Woman's Labour*, was actually published after reading "published in 1739" (correct) on the first page of the chapter, but then turning to the endnote to find that "Collier's poem was first published in *Poems on Several Occasions* (Mary Ayres, 1762)" (50, 148). A slightly revised version of the poem did appear in that 1762 collection, but it was first published in 1739 and went to three editions by 1740. To make matters worse, the note does not identify which text of the poem Milne quotes from. Additionally, though she is aware that Collier was responding to the 1730 pirated version of Stephen Duck's "The Thresher's Labour," Milne inexplicably quotes from a facsimile reprint of the 1736 version of Duck's poem. At some point in the book-making process, chapters 2 and 3 were reordered, but this change was not reflected in the brief summaries of them that appear in the introduction (31); and the conclusion contains the following gaffe: "Perkins argues that clear readings of cannot ..." (132): readings of what? Such infelicities notwithstanding, Milne's study is essential reading for specialists interested in what a historically sensitive ecocriticism can bring to our understanding of these labouring-class women poets and their work.

William J. Christmas
San Francisco State University

Franco Piva, ed. *Les mémoires de Pamela, écrits par elle-même*. Fasano: Schena Editore, 2007. €30. 310pp. ISBN 978-88-8229-697-1.

Nicolas François de Neufchâteau. *Paméla, ou La Vertu récompensée*, SVEC2007:04, ed. Martial Poirson. Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, 2007. xv+264pp. £60/€95/US\$115. ISBN 978-0-7294-0906-3.

The controversy over Samuel Richardson's astonishingly popular novel *Pamela*, first published anonymously in two volumes in November 1740, with two further volumes added a year later, spread rapidly across the Channel. By March 1741, Richardson was already advertising an authorized French translation, which duly appeared in October, less than a year after the first English edition. The year

1742 saw the publication of a waspish pamphlet, *Lettre sur Pamela*, probably by the Abbé Marquet, as well as a staunchly pro-*Pamela* critique by Pierre Desfontaines, *Observations sur les écrits modernes*, and a hostile pamphlet response, *Lettre à Monsieur l'Abbé Des Fontaines sur Pamela*. Then in 1743, three comic adaptations were produced in Paris, with mixed success: Louis de Boissy's *Paméla en France*, Nivelles de La Chaussée's *Pamela*, and Claude Godard d'Acour's *La Déroute des Paméla*.

A hitherto unknown work, *Les mémoires de Pamela, écrits par elle-même*, was also published in 1743, ostensibly in London. Desfontaines mentions this third-person abridgment of *Pamela*, but it is absent from William Sale's still standard bibliography of Richardson, and recent critics of the *Pamela* controversy ignore it as well. Franco Piva does a great service in making this work available to modern readers, basing his text on a copy at the Taylor Institution, Oxford, the only one known to be extant. His footnotes point to passages in which the *Mémoires* diverges from the novel, consider particularities of diction and style, elucidate obscurities, and explain eighteenth-century English customs. Supplementing the notes is a glossary of terms that have changed their signification since the mid-1740s, such as "aimable," "cabinet," and "générosité."

The 110-page introduction to Piva's edition, almost a monograph in length itself, is replete with information on the early stages of the *querelle de Pamela* in France and the place of the *Mémoires* in the controversy. Piva also undertakes a detailed analysis of the text, which reduces Richardson's four volumes to just over a quarter of their length. He notes that Richardson's original novel occupies 254 pages of the *Mémoires*, while the continuation takes up only 147 pages: a sensible redistribution of the material, since the continuation is much less lively than the first two volumes. The abridging and reworking of Richardson's material are carried out, as Piva demonstrates, with considerable skill. Piva is unable to put a name to the anonymously published work, but he does suggest, convincingly, that at least two different hands were responsible for the two parts, noting substantial differences between the ways in which they alter Richardson's text. In this respect, the *Mémoires* resembles the authorized French translation of *Pamela*, for which two or more writers were responsible. For all its amplitude, Piva's introduction overlooks one important question: where was the *Mémoires* published, and by whom? The title page, for which a facsimile is helpfully provided, states only that the work was published "à Londres," probably falsely; it would be useful to know if there are any other clues to the work's origin, either in the sole surviving copy or elsewhere.

Unlike the long-neglected *Mémoires*, much recent critical discussion focuses on Nicolas François de Neufchâteau's comedy *Paméla, ou La Vertu récompensée*, written in 1788 and first performed at the Comédie-Française in August 1793. Martial Poirson's excellent critical edition, the first modern edition of the play, is based on the prompter's manuscript, with variants from the 1793 and 1795 published texts at the foot of the page. The variants are important, since, with the Terror well under way, Neufchâteau was arrested after the play's first performance and was in danger of being guillotined. Neufchâteau's play, based on Goldini's comedy *Pamela nubile* (1750), was held to be counter-revolutionary by the Committee of Public Safety. Considered scandalously radical by many of its critics in the 1740s, including Henry Fielding, *Pamela* was now being condemned for not being radical enough. Poirson's textual apparatus reveals changes that helped keep the author alive; seldom have revisions been undertaken for such high stakes.

Poirson's edition, attractively produced by the Voltaire Foundation, features a voluminous introduction of some 105 pages. He discusses the tumultuous conditions under which the play was first performed at the Comédie-Française, furnishing much information on the author, the theatre, and the cast, as well as on those who sought to condemn the play. He also places Neufchâteau's comedy in the context of the evolving response to *Pamela* by French dramatists, from the stage plays of 1743 through Voltaire's *Nanine* (1749) and on to Goldoni's adaptation, which was well received in pre-Revolutionary France. The edition is richly illustrated with twenty plates, including portraits of Neufchâteau and the principal actors in the ill-fated production of his *Paméla*. Documents relating to the text of the play are also reproduced; four illustrations showing pages of the prompter's copy, with marginal commentary by the revolutionary censor, are especially revealing. A preface by Joël Huthwohl, archivist-in-chief at the Bibliothèque-Musée de la Comédie-Française, briefly considers the grim record of censorship and prosecutions to which this illustrious company has been subject.

Poirson also provides four appendices to this exceptionally well-conceived edition. Two of these, concerning the production of Neufchâteau's comedy, are of particular interest. The first reprints verses by the author addressed to Elise Lange and Abraham Joseph Bénard, dit Fleury, the actors who played the parts of Pamela and Bonfil (Richardson's Mr B.). The second includes a moving account by Fleury himself, published in his posthumous memoirs of 1847, of the production's trials and tribulations and the severe dangers

that the author faced: “un ordre péremptoire nous vint de suspendre les représentations de *Paméla*: les vers de la pièce tendaient, disait l'exposé des motifs, à rétablir, ou du moins à faire regretter l'ordre de la noblesse” (252).

Together, these fine editions make an important contribution to recent work on the reception of *Pamela* in France. They also play a part in a larger field of enquiry: the diverse ways in which the eighteenth-century English novel was transformed at the hands of its numerous European readers.

Peter Sabor
McGill University

Édouard Langille, éd. *Candide en Dannemarc, ou l'optimisme des honnêtes gens*. Durham: Durham Modern Language Series, 2007. 196pp. UK13.50. ISBN 978-0-907310-63-1.

Dans cette édition critique de *Candide en Dannemarc, ou l'optimisme des honnêtes gens* (1767), Édouard Langille tire de l'oubli une imitation de *Candide* (1759) que non seulement Grimm, Fréron et les périodiques de l'époque passent sous silence, mais que le public lettré a ignoré pendant plus de 150 ans. En expliquant les circonstances entourant la réception de ce roman de Charles-Claude-Florent de Thorel de Campigneulle, qui se veut la suite de *Candide, seconde partie* (1760) de Du Laurens, il fait sortir de l'ombre un texte susceptible de transformer le regard que posent les critiques sur l'œuvre de Voltaire et sur ses avatars. Dans l'introduction, É. Langille s'interroge sur la documentation historique, la langue et le style du roman en question et poursuit son étude dans les notes qui proposent un complément riche de références et qui indiquent avec précision les passages de *Candide* et de sa *Seconde partie* qui sont en lien direct avec l'intrigue qui se déploie dans le texte.

Alors que ce contre-modèle de *Candide* n'abonde pas dans le sens du conte philosophique de Voltaire, qui, comme le rappelle É. Langille, comporte « un démenti mordant du credo de l'Optimisme » (2), il poursuit le traitement peu favorable que Voltaire réservait à la noblesse et à ses privilèges. Le recours à « l'achat d'une généalogie » (60) pour conférer à Candide un statut noble et pour faire de lui « un homme tout neuf » (65), combiné à l'attitude du héros qui s'enlise dans des raisonnements spécieux qui le confirment dans ses principes et qui le convainquent que sa relation avec une femme plus noble que